

STATEMENT DELIVERED BY

FATHER MALONE

"WHATEVER HAPPENED TO LOYOLA CAMPAIGN"

Thursday, February 7th, 1974

Noon - F.C. SMITH

"Whatever happened to Loyola" is a question of such importance to students at Loyola that their leadership has authorized this campaign of study, statement and searching. In so doing, students are within their rights and are acting in the best of academic traditions. They would be delinquent in their duty if they mutely accepted conditions that curtailed the sweep of their educational opportunity. I explicitly acknowledge the importance of this exercise, and I believe that his response to your invitation to-day is some evidence of the importance that Rector O'Brien attaches to the issues involved.

In the last several days, a plethora of views has been aired - from many sides but, I think you would agree, most fulsomely and widely by Loyola students. I do not intend to catalogue the heads of debate or to comment on each and every detail.

But I do wish to emphasize this central point that may have been lost in the heat of discussion. The creation and welfare of Concordia is an objective strongly endorsed by overwhelming majorities on both campuses. I may say plainly, that I detect no mandate to reopen negotiations that ^{have} the blessing of the Board of Governors of Sir George Williams University and of the Board of Trustees of Loyola College. Indeed, if there is a call for further action, I read strong urging that the Government, one of the partners incidentally in creating Concordia, rise out of its long delay to regulate the uncertain situation in which we live and struggle to operate.

In dealing with the agreements

In dealing with the agreements that have been reached between Sir George Williams and Loyola, we can very easily fall into one of two opposite errors. The first is the long and laborious negotiations that required hundreds of hours over several years can be set aside at will by any group that finds this or that detail not entirely to its liking. I hope that it is clear to this student body that agreements in which, at least on the Loyola side, the Board, the Senate, the faculty the student association, administration, alumni and friends from the community took part, must be accepted as the basis for the development of Concordia and indeed for the future of Loyola. On the other hand, there is none of us who participated in the negotiations, agreements and current operations of Concordia, who believes that every question in every detail has been settled by the agreed articles. We are all aware that there are a number of items below the general articles of agreement that must be under continuing discussion, must conform to the changing realities of the New university, must be adapted to further its welfare as an important part of the educational establishment in Quebec. In making this last remark about details still to be fleshed out, I am fully confident that I am not throwing a gauntlet down to anyone. All of us in senior administration have enough experience to know structures, modalities, objectives and representations will -- always within the terms of the general agreement, be suitable subjects for ongoing debate.

I said that I was not going to comment on the details of grievances put forward by this student assembly. I do feel it my duty, however, to point out that in matters of negotiation, the two institutions came to the table as equals; we did not agree, however, that parity between Sir George Williams and Loyola was the

cont'd.....necessary or even the

necessary or even the equitable condition for Concordia to flourish through our ongoing collaboration. Somewhere in your last assembly you made mention about membership on committees. These committees in the academic area or in other areas are not generally speaking a part of the agreements which bear the seal of the two boards. They are therefore legitimate objects of discussion and debate. I feel confident that if a good case can be made for redistribution of the weight from either campus, our colleagues at Sir George Williams University will fairly consider any reasonable proposal.

It is sometimes very difficult for those of us who sat at the negotiating table and approached the same problems often enough from different points of view to have the fact firmly in our minds that negotiations on the general terms of agreement are over and that our role as negotiators or official interpreters of what was negotiated has come to an end. We are now given the task of filling this or that office in Concordia University and of bringing it, through Sir George & Loyola, to its own rightful place of pride and achievement. The agreements that we reached during the time of negotiation, the agreements that have been ratified by the two boards, cannot be faithfully represented by any collage of snippets selected here or there to prove a partisan point of view. No, those agreements are far too delicate, too vibrant, and, I may say, too important to the lives and careers of students and faculty and indeed to the future of the land, to be reduced simply to a matter of slogans.

When I sift through the reports, documentation and interviews that have come from
cont'd.....this campaign....

this campaign "Whatever happened to Loyola", I believe that students are less concerned with any protracted discussion about details and more definitely upset by what they call attitudes on the Sir George Williams campus. They refer to a "take over" attitude, to unbalanced representation on working committees and to a host of other things that in their view can be interpreted as a wrong attitude on the part of our colleagues downtown. As a senior officer of Concordia, and a representative from the Loyola campus/^I can assure you that there are people on the Sir George Williams campus who detect in various reports, actions, ^a statements and objections/wrong attitude on the part of people at Loyola. If they were asked to put a name on that attitude, they would simply say that the people at Loyola want to participate in the University Charter but retain all the autonomy that they previously had without trying to form one true university. Let me say at once that no matter what the evidence may seem to be, the overwhelming attitude on either campus is wrong described in the terms which I have just set forth. Let me repeat once again that the majority of people on both campuses understand the risks that are involved, understand the difficulties that are still to be resolved but have given their full-hearted support to the birth of Concordia University. On the other hand, some of the grievances, real or alleged, are grounds for apprehension, distrust and recrimination. We would be entirely foolish to pretend that a new university is not going to experience differences of opinion, the tensions, the resentments even that seem always to crop up where human beings try to work together, even in well-established universities. I think that the airing of your grievances to-day is a healthy thing. I think that the readiness of Dr. O'Brien, Rector of Concordia, to come and listen to your viewpoint and to comment on it is a very hopeful sign for the future. I think, further, that your own willingness to

accept the proffered support of the student body at Sir George Williams and to believe that the people at Sir George Williams will give a fair hearing to anything you propose constitute a clear indication that we have at hand on both campuses the resources to form one team in the formation of one university.

If you agree that grievances, objections and resentments are part of the human condition, then you must be prepared to deal with them. In my view, proper procedure is that we should courteously air our differences, we should air them as a matter of fact or of perception based in fact or imagination, that we should put them forward without trying to find a culprit, without trying to assign wrong motivation or bad will. In our present strange position before the law, all of us involved in Concordia have blurred guidelines on which to carry out our daily duties. But we are confident that we can correct any mistakes that may arise.

In a recent thoughtful lecture, Dr. Joseph Hofbeck of the Faculty of Theology pointed out that relations between opposing or competing institutions that are obliged to cope with each other for internal or external reasons ordinarily go through three phases. The first is the stage of immediate reaction: measure the other, accuse the other, fight the other, reject the other. The process goes on to a second stage which is the objectification of the opposite partner, in which the one partner considers himself autonomous and self sufficient and that everything else, including the other partner, is simply an object for study and use. And the third stage in the process (if the process is still continuing) is a mediated togetherness

in mutual recognition, respect and mature dialogue. Unfortunately, we have to go through the first two stages but we have no reason for congratulation until we have found ourselves well into the third. Some of our students have asked the question "Whatever happened to Loyola?" I think their question is a useful one and I hope the process of answering has been fruitful.

However, I should like to suggest in closing that a more important question before all of us is what will become of Concordia. In my remarks to this campus over the years I have continually stressed that a university is basically a community of teachers and students. Everything else on campus is in place to further their efforts as learning, searching, teaching persons, as human beings in search of the fulness of their humanity. On both campuses we have great assets of competence and dedication, on both campuses we have the conviction that Concordia has a vital role to play in our own lives and the life of Quebec. I hope we can take the risks to fulfill the promise.